



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,800	11/03/2003	William J. Allen	10015635-4	6262
7590 HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration P. O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			EXAMINER KOVALICK, VINCENT E	
			ART UNIT 2629	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	04/04/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/700,800	ALLEN ET AL.
	Examiner Vincent E. Kovalick	Art Unit 2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15,18-29,31,33,34,37-39,41,42,44-46,48,49 and 51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 33,34,37-39,41,42,44-46,49 and 51 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7,9,10,13-15,18-29,31,46 and 48 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 8,11 and 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 03 November 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/1/04 & 5/14/04</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

AILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to Applicant's Patent Application, Serial No. 10/700,800, with a File Date of November 3, 2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marz et al. (USP 6,633, 306)

Relative to claim 1, Marz et al. teaches an active matrix Liquid Crystal Display (col. 2, lines 5-67 and col. 3, lines 1-22); Marz et al. further teaches a display comprising: a plurality of display elements capable of controlling light within a visible-light spectrum, the display elements being arranged over a display surface of the display; a plurality of receivers arranged with the display elements over the display surface, the one or more receivers being coupled with the display elements and adapted to receive transmitted image information and activate the display elements in response to, and in correspondence with, the image information (col. 6, lines 5-30).

The difference between the teachings of the instant invention and that of the Marz et al. is wherein the instant invention refers to the pixel control circuitry as a "receiver" wherein Marz et al. refers to the same control circuitry as "controllable switches" (Fig. 2, item 32).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill at the time if the invention that the teachings of Marz et al. would address the limitation as taught in claim 1 of the instant invention.

Regarding claim 6, Marz et al. further **teaches** a display wherein the display elements include transmissive components configured to regulate transmission of light to the display surface in correspondence with the image information (Abstract).

4. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marz et al. as applied to claim 1 in item 3 hereinabove, and further in view of Harada et al. (Pub. No. US 2001/0040542).

Relative to claim 2, Marz et al. **does not teach** a display wherein the display elements include red, green and blue display components arranged so as to cooperate in producing light within the visible-light spectrum.

Harada et al. **teaches** a display element, writing method and writing apparatus (pg. 3, paras. 0039-0043) Harada et al. further **teaches** a display wherein the display elements include red, green and blue display components arranged so as to cooperate in producing light within the visible-light spectrum (pg. 2, para. 0028 and Abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the devices as taught by Marz et al. the feature as taught by Harada et al. in order to introduce the three basic colors, (red, green and blue) that are combined to generate additional colors.

Regarding claim 3, Harada et al. further **teaches** the display wherein the display elements further include at least one of cyan, magenta, yellow, white and black display components, arranged so as to cooperate in producing light within the visible-light spectrum (pg. 2, para. 0028 and Abstract).

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marz et al. as applied to claim 1 in item 3 hereinabove, and further in view of Nakajima et al. (USP 6,229,531).

Relative to claim 4 Marz et al. **does not teach** a display wherein the display elements include emissive components capable of emitting light within the visible-light spectrum.

Nakajima et al. **teaches** an active matrix display device (col. 3, lines 14-67 and col. 4, lines 1-16); Nakajima et al. further **teaches** a display wherein the display elements include emissive components capable of emitting light within the visible-light spectrum (col. 11, lines 28-35).

Art Unit: 2629

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Marz et al. the feature as taught by Nakajima et al. in order to provide light emitting devices for application in a image display device projecting an image in the visible-light spectrum.

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marz et al. as applied to claim 1 in item 3 hereinabove, and further in view of Meada (Pub. No. US 2003/0067457).

Relative to claim 5, Martz et al. **does not teach** a display wherein the display elements include reflective components capable of reflecting light within the visible-light spectrum.

Meada **teaches** a reflective display device and electronic device (pgs. 1/2 paras. 0010-0016); Meada further **teaches** a display wherein the display elements include reflective components capable of reflecting light within the visible-light spectrum.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Marz et al. the feature as taught by Meada in order to provide a quick-response reflective display device that has increased display brightness and contrast and that achieves high display quality.

7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marz et al. taken with Nakajima et al. as applied to claim 4 in item 5 hereinabove.

Regarding claim 7, Marz et al. further **teaches** a display wherein the transmissive components are liquid crystal devices (Abstract and col. 6, lines 5-6).

8. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marz et al. as applied to claim 1 in item 3 hereinabove, and further in view of Aritake et al. (USP 6,478,429).

Regarding claim 9, Marz et al. **does not teach** a display wherein the receivers are oriented on the display to receive image information from a side of the display corresponding with the display surface.

Aritake et al. **teaches** a reflective projector (col. 2, lines 32-54); Aritake et al. further **teaches** a display wherein the receivers are oriented on the display to receive image information from a side of the display corresponding with the display surface (col. 16, lines 34-37).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Marz et al. the feature as taught by Aritake et al. in order to provide the means

Art Unit: 2629

whereby the image information could be projected to receivers on the display device surface.

9. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marz et al. as applied to claim 1 in item 3 hereinabove, and further in view of Abramson et al. (Pub. No. 2003/0214695).

Regarding claim 10, Marz et al. **does not teach** a display wherein the display elements and the one or more receivers are disposed on a flexible substrate.

Abramson et al. **teaches** an electro-optic display (pgs. 10/11, paras. 0093-0132); Abramson et al. further **teaches** a display wherein the display elements and the one or more receivers are disposed on a flexible substrate (pg. 13, para. 0163).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Marz et al. the feature as taught by Abramson et al. in order to cast the display devices (pixels and support logic e.g. receivers) on a flexible substrate to expand the field of applications and conditions to which the display device can be adapted.

10. Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marz et al. as applied to claim 1 in item 3 hereinabove, and further in view of Loose (Pub. No. US 2004/0227827).

Relative to claim 13, Marz et al. **does not teach** a display wherein the one or more receivers each include one or more infrared phototransistors.

Loose **teaches** an image sensing system including image sensors (pg.1, paras. 0009-9912); Loose further **teaches** a display wherein the one or more receivers each include one or more infrared phototransistors (pg. 2, para 0023).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Marz et al. the feature as taught by Loose in order to provide a signal receiver that is sensitive to visible light.

Regarding claim 14, Loose further **teaches** a display wherein the one or more receivers each include one or more visible-spectrum light-receiving diodes (pg. 2, para. 0023).

Relative to claim 15, Loose further still **teaches** a display wherein the one or more receivers include one or more visible-spectrum light phototransistors (pg. 2, para.0023)

Art Unit: 2629

11. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marz et al. as applied to claim 1 in item 3 hereinabove, and further in view of Shimada (Pub. No. 2003/0132901).

Relative to claim 18, Marz et al. **does not teach** a display wherein the image information is received as light within the visible-light spectrum, and wherein color of the received light defines the image information.

Shimada **teaches** a field sequential color display device (pgs. 1/2, paras. 0005-0014); Shimada further **teaches** a display wherein the image information is received as light within the visible-light spectrum, and wherein color of the received light defines the image information (pg. 3, para. 0028).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Marz et al. the feature as taught by Shimada in order to provide means for driving a display device to develop an image based on image information corresponding to a degree of color activating sensors that respond to visible light characteristics.

12. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marz et al. as applied to claim 1 in item 3 hereinabove, and further in view Alkouh (Pub. No. 2003/0189568).

Relative to claim 19, Marz et al. **does not teach** a display wherein the image information is received as light within the visible-light spectrum, and wherein intensity of the received light defines the image information.

Alkouh **teaches** a graphics image produced for a computer display with depth of field information (pg. 2, paras. 0013-0014); Alkouh further **teaches** a display wherein the image information is received as light within the visible-light spectrum, and wherein intensity of the received light defines the image information (pg. 1, para. 0005)

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Marz et al. the feature as taught by Alkouh in order to provide means for driving a display device to develop an image based on image information corresponding to the intensity wherein the intensity of light received by the display sensors defines image information.

13. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marz et al. as applied to claim 1 in item 3 hereinabove, and further in view Russ et al. (USP 7,071,629).

Relative to claim 20, Marz et al. **does not teach** a display wherein the image information is communicated to the receivers as a plurality of infrared frequencies.

Russ et al. **teaches** an image display device incorporating drive circuits on active substrate (col. 2, lines 6-67); Russ further **teaches** a display wherein the image information is communicated to the receivers as a plurality of infrared frequencies (col. 21, lines 31). It being understood that infrared signals would be included in the group of signal that could be transmitted to a wireless receiver feeding an image display device.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Marz et al. the feature as taught by Russ et al. in order to provide the means for processing image information transmitted in the form of infrared frequencies.

14. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marz et al. as applied to claim 1 in item 3 hereinabove, and further in view Tamura (USP 4,458,264)

Relative to claim 21, Marz et al. **does not teach** a display wherein the image information is defined by a received pattern of low-intensity visible light frequencies.

Tamura **teaches** an multi-color original reading apparatus (col. 1, lines 49-68); Tamura further **teaches** a display wherein the image information is defined by a received pattern of low-intensity visible light frequencies (col. 5, lines 31-44).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Marz et al. the feature as taught by Tamura in order to provide the means for processing image information transmitted in the form of low-intensity visible light frequencies.

15. Claims 22 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irwin (USP 5,784,038).

Regarding claim 22, Irwin **teaches** a color projection system such that a display controller is responsive to an RGB signal causing pixel colors to be projected onto a screen display (col. 1, lines 65-67; col. 2, lines 1-67 and col. 3, lines 1-28); Irwin further **teaches** a display cell comprising: a display element capable of controlling light within a visible-light spectrum; a receiver in proximity to the display element and

Art Unit: 2629

configured to optically receive image information associated with an image element to be displayed on the display element; and interface circuitry coupled with the receiver and the display element, the interface circuitry being configured to convey signals corresponding to the received image information from the receiver to the display element for display (col. 4, lines 20-43).

The difference between the teachings of the instant invention and that of Irwin is the nature of generating the image signals, wherein Irwin use a color wheel as the source for RGB color generation, wherein the instant invention takes in a light with a visible-light spectrum.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill at the time if the invention that the teachings of Irwin would address the limitation as taught in claim 22 of the instant invention.

Regarding claim 31, Irwin further **teaches** a display cell wherein the interface circuitry includes decode circuitry configured to convert the received image information into signals corresponding to a color within the visible-light spectrum to be displayed by the display element (col. 4, lines 19-43).

16. Claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irwin as applied to claim 22 in item 15 hereinabove, and further in view of Kobayashi (Pub. No. US 2002/0001066).

Relative to claim 23, Irwin **does not teach** a display cell wherein the display element includes plural display components, such that the plural display components cooperate in producing light within the visible-light spectrum.

Kobayashi **teaches** a projection display apparatus (pg. 2, paras. 0023-0034); Kobayashi further **teaches** a display cell wherein the display element includes plural display components, such that the plural display components cooperate in producing light within the visible-light spectrum (pg. 1, paras. 0002, 0005, 0007 and Fig. 1B).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Irwin the feature as taught by Kobayashi in order to provide display element with the capacity to receive signals relative to light within a visible-light spectrum and in turn emit the light color corresponding to the said signals.

Art Unit: 2629

Regarding claim 24, Kobayashi further **teaches** a display cell wherein the plural display components include a red display component, a green display component and a blue display component (pg. 1, para. 0007 and Fig. 1B).

Regarding claim 25, Kobayashi further **teaches** a display cell wherein the display elements include emissive components capable of emitting light within the visible-light spectrum (pg. 1, para. 0007 and Fig. 1B).

17. Claims 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irwin, as applied to claim 22 in item 15 hereinabove, and further in view of Aritake et al. (6,478,429).

Relative to claim 26, Irwin **does not teach** a display cell wherein the display elements includes reflective components capable of reflecting light within the visible-light spectrum.

Aritake et al. **teaches** a reflective projector (col. 2, lines 32-54); Aritake et al. further **teaches** a display cell wherein the display elements include reflective components capable of reflecting light within the visible-light spectrum (col. 5, lines 45-57).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Irwin the feature as taught by Aritake et al. in order to provide a display element technology that supports reflective projectors which are small, efficient inexpensive and has high color purity.

Regarding claim 27, Aritake et al. further **teaches** a display cell wherein the display element includes a transmissive component configured to regulate transmission of light in correspondence with the image information (col. 15, lines 57-67; col. 16, lines 1-7 and Fig. 11B).

18. Claims 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irwin as applied to claim 22 in item 15 hereinabove, and further in view of Loose (Pub. No. US 2004/0227827).

Relative to claim 28, Irwin **does not teach** a display cell wherein the receiver is an infrared receiver. Loose **teaches** an image sensing system including image sensors (pg.1, paras. 0009-0012)I Loose further **teaches** a display wherein the receiver is an infrared receiver (pg. 2, para. 0023).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to

Art Unit: 2629

the device as taught by Irwin the feature as taught by Loose in order to provide a signal receiver that is sensitive to visible light.

Regarding claim 29, Loose further **teaches** a display wherein the receiver is a visible-spectrum light-receiver (pg. 2, para. 0023).

19. Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gettemy (Pub. No. 2003/0156100) taken with Heie (USP 6,900,798).

Relative to claim 46, Gettemy **teaches** a display system (pg. 1, paras. 0010-0014); Gettemy further **teaches** a display comprising: a plurality of display means for controlling light within a visible-light spectrum, the display means being arranged over a display surface of the display; and a plurality of receiver means arranged with the display means over the display surface, the one or more receiver means being coupled with the display means (pg. 1, para. 0011; pg. 2, paras. 0032-0032 and Fig. 6). Gettemy **does not teach** a plurality of receivers adapted to receive transmitted image information and activate the display means in response to, and in correspondence with, the image information.

Heie **teaches** an improved liquid crystal display that includes a user-selectable method for reducing the amount of electrical power consumed by the LCD (col. 3, lines 15-41); Heie further **teaches** a plurality of receivers adapted to receive transmitted image information and activate the display means in response to, and in correspondence with, the image information.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Gettemy the feature as taught by Heie in order to put in place the means necessary to receive image information and in turn process said information to facilitate image display.

20. Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gettemy taken with Henderson et al. (USP 5,398,082).

Regarding claim 48 Gettemy **teaches** a display system comprising: an optically-addressed display including a plurality of display means for controlling light within a visible-light spectrum, and a plurality of receiver means for optically receiving image information, the receiver means being distributed over the optically-addressed display with the display means and coupled with the display means (pg. 1, para. 0011);

Art Unit: 2629

Gettemy **does not teach** and a projector means for projecting the image information onto the display means, wherein the projector means optically addresses the plurality of display means via the receiver means.

Henderson **teaches** a scanned illumination for light valve video projector (col. 2, lines 19-40); Henderson further **teaches** and a projector means for projecting the image information onto the display means, wherein the projector means optically addresses the plurality of display means via the receiver means (col. 2, lines 19-40 and Abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Gettemy the feature as taught by Henderson in order to put in place the means necessary to generate and project the image information onto the display means receivers optically addressed to display the intended image.

Allowable Subject Matter

21. Claims 8 and 11-12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Relative to claim 8, the major difference between the teachings of the prior art of record (USP 6,633,306, Marz et al.; USP 5,784,038, Irwin and Pub. No. US 2002/0001066, Kobayashi) and that of the instant invention is that said prior art of record **does not teach** a display wherein the receivers are oriented on the display to receive image information from a side of the display opposite of the display surface.

Regarding 11, the major difference between the teachings of said the prior art of record and that of the instant invention is that said prior art of record **does not teach** a display wherein the receivers each includes one or more infrared receiving diodes.

Regarding 12, the major difference between the teachings of said the prior art of record and that of the instant invention is that said prior art of record **does not teach** a display wherein the one or more receivers each includes plural infrared receiving diodes corresponding, respectively, to at least a red

Art Unit: 2629

emissive component, a green emissive component and a blue emissive component of the display elements.

22. Claims 33, 34, 37-39, 41, 42, 44-45, 49 and 51 are allowed.

23 The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Relative to claim 33, the major difference between the teachings of said the prior art of record and that of the instant invention is that said prior art of record **does not teach** a display system comprising: an optically-addressed display including a plurality of display elements adapted to control light within a visible-light spectrum, and a plurality of receivers distributed over the display with the display elements and coupled with the display elements, the receivers being configured to optically receive image information; and a projector configured to project the image information onto the display, wherein the projector optically addresses the plurality of display elements via the receivers.

Regarding claim 41, the major difference between the teachings of said the prior art of record and that of the instant invention is that said prior art of record **does not teach** a method for displaying images comprising: optically addressing a plurality of display cells distributed across a display surface by projecting image information associated with an image to be displayed, the display cells each including one or more receiver capable of optically receiving projected image information and one or more display element capable of controlling light within a visible-light spectrum; receiving the image information on a surface of the display; converting the image information into signals corresponding to colors and intensities associated with portions of the image to be displayed; and displaying the image via the plurality of display elements.

Relative to claim 49, the major difference between the teachings of said the prior art of record and that of the instant invention is that said prior art of record **does not teach** a display comprising: a plurality of display elements capable of controlling light within a visible-light spectrum, the display elements being arranged over a display surface of the display; and a plurality of receivers distributed with the display elements over the display surface, the receivers being coupled with the display elements and adapted to receive transmitted image information and activate the display elements in response to, and in

Art Unit: 2629

correspondence with, the image information, wherein a first display element is associated with a first receiver and a second display element is associated with a second receiver, the first display element being coupled with the second receiver and the second display element being coupled with the first receiver so as to affect a relative brightness of the first and second display elements with respect to each other.

Regarding claim 51, the major difference between the teachings of said the prior art of record and that of the instant invention is that said prior art of record **does not teach** a display system comprising: an optically-addressed display including a plurality of display elements distributed over the display and adapted to control light within a visual light spectrum, and a plurality of visible-light receivers coupled with the display elements, the receivers being distributed over the display within the display elements and configured to optically receive image information; and a projector configured to project the image information onto the display, wherein the projector optically addresses the plurality of display elements via the receivers, the projector being configured to contemporaneously project information of a complete image to be displayed and the image information being projected using low-intensity visible-light.

To Respond

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vincent E. Kovalick whose telephone number is 571-272-7669. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30- 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on 571-272-7681. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Vincent E. Kovalick
March 28, 2007



BIPIN SHALWALA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600